

MINUTES FOR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

October 24, 2002

ATTENDANCE:

Present:

Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Larry Schlereth, Bernie Goldstein, Rick Luttmann, Susan McKillop, Robert McNamara, Elizabeth Stanny, Karen Thompson, Art Warmoth and Steve Wilson

Guests: Bill Crowley and Perry Marker

Meeting began at 3:06pm

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

N. Byrne noted that No. 9 and No. 11 were Time Certain items and was concerned about their order on the agenda.

R. Luttmann: Stated that it did not matter where the Time Certain items were on the agenda, but that they would be discussed at the required time.

R. McNamara: Suggested that Resolution regarding the War with Iraq that was passed by the Senate last week, be sent right away to the appropriate government officials – but was not sure which officials should receive them. Who sends them?

S. Wilson: The Resolution calls for the Resolution to be distributed by the secretary.

R. McNamara: Do we need to get permission?

S. Wilson: No.

Should be sent to Woolsey, Feinstein (perhaps twice) and Boxer.

N. Byrne: Agenda will stand as it has been modified.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 10, 2002

The following corrections were requested:

R. Luttmann: We don't need to account for anyone's absence on the minutes.

We do need to know who is presiding over the meeting. Also, there is a difference between someone having a no report and being absent. Even though the list at the beginning of the minutes tells us who is here and not, I think it would be more appropriate that under Reports that if they are here with no report, then report "no report" but if they are absent, write "absent".

Page 3: Susan McKillop asked how many currently enrolled students we have, it says "slightly over 8,000, target was 6,750". I don't think those numbers could be right.

S. Wilson: Isn't the 8,000 a headcount and the 6,750 the FTE?

R. Luttmann: Probably, I think we need to clarify that.

Then on Page 5 just above the middle of the page where we are concluding our discussion about the Prop 47 Resolution. It says, "now due to time constraints the first reading will be waived." Well, we cannot really say that. It should say, "We will propose that it be waived" or something like that.

Finally, on Page 6, just below the middle of the page under Faculty Emeritus Policy, it says "reasoning for changes", but I think it is actually reasoning against changes - specifically the first two comments.

E. Stanny: (Suggested some minor change but the tape was unclear).

R. Coleman-Senghor: Page 3 - "The voice of the faculty are in this report". My language actually was, "We want to make sure that the voice of the faculty will be in the WASC report".

Minutes approved as amended.

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

None

REPORTS

CHAIR OF THE FACULTY – N. BYRNE

Most present are aware that the election of the faculty members to the Provost Search Committee has been concluded. Note, a feature of the election. By the deadline, 197 ballots had been received and on Monday, Carol and I counted the ballots and then of course I provided a report to President Armiñana about the results of the balloting. Then the next day, 50 ballots were delivered by the mail department. I was very interested to see what the final tally would be, even though the 50 ballots could not be included. As it turned out, the votes were distributed as were the original 197. That was good! In future we may want to expand the time of ballots or again to make certain that they need to be in the Senate Office by a particular time.

R. Coleman-Senghor: This main thing is that the number of people who voted.

N. Byrne: The names of those elected in order are Ayala, Luttmann, Orlick.

R. Luttmann: You skipped Paula Hammett. We have also received our letters of appointment.

R. Coleman-Senghor: The searches are determined by standard policy, right?

R. Luttmann: Yes.

R. Coleman-Senghor: Does the group of policies say that someone from the Alumni office is elected?

R. Luttmann: No, but gives the President some authority to appoint an additional member.

R. Coleman-Senghor: What about the President's response regarding the cost involved? The response that we received really doesn't say much. All it says is that I have the authority. It does tell me much about collaboration. I am asking for someone to tell me "I have the authority", of course he has the authority. But what we were asking about was whether or not he was going to in fact respond to this question of the fiscal and the concerns of the faculty.

N. Byrne: I can convey my understanding. That is the only communication I received from the President regarding this matter. I have read this a few times, my interpretation is that he is communicating that the making of such a recommendation as embodied by the resolution is beyond what he regards as our proper sphere of influence.

L. Schlereth: Bernie and I can add some comments because we did discuss this with Ruben. I think at the moment we are anxious to see how robust the candidate pool is before proceeding to a headhunter. This cost of the search is still going to be pricey.

Robert Coleman-Senghor: Not only the cost, but the utilization of oncampus resources. Which means basically faculty and other supporting administrative elements. It seems to me a very idea to do this even with setting aside the subject of cost. The more people who are involved in the academic life of the campus who are participating and supporting that search, would enrich the quality of the search.

L. Schlereth: During the last search, there was a meeting of the deans, the associated VP's, forums. I would imagine that unless this committee were different that the same type of meetings would still happen for this search. This will happen once the search gets down to the top five candidates.

B. Goldstein: I would imagine that the President would appreciate recommendations from the faculty.

R. McNamara: Why does this search cost so much?

L. Schlereth: Our Human Resource area has strongly advised us to place announcements in certain standard publications, this will also insure a diversified pool, but these ads are expensive. Then there is the cost of bringing a candidate to the campus for interviews. This cost depends upon where the candidate is from. A local candidate will cost less due to lower travel costs. Thirdly, is the relocation costs. This can be very expensive.

R. Coleman-Senghor: The unfortunate thing about this is, if you look at the lifetime of a Provost here, and compare it to the timeline of a faculty member. It is interesting that we

spend so little on the faculty who will be here for 25 or 30 years and we spend so much on a Provost search which is less than 5 years.

We should also be looking at our contacts and recommend those individuals. This would help bring down the cost of the search and give us a more diverse pool of candidates.

PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY – R. ARMINANA

Not present.

PROVOST/VICE PRESIDENT – B. GOLDSTEIN

Because of your strong interest in improving the policy for advising. Rand Link just gave me a copy of a draft Resolution to Review the Current Advising Policy coming from AS. This is more of a heads-up. Academic Affairs will be dealing with this so we just wanted to give you a heads-up.

A. Warmoth: If AS just passed this Resolution it should go to this committee as part of their report.

B. Goldstein: Good point.

S. Wilson: Just got an email from Ephraim Freed stating that AS cannot waive their first reading, so it has to go through two readings.

STATEWIDE SENATOR – S. MCKILLOP

Have not met. Nothing to do but wring our hands.

CHAIR-ELECT OF THE SENATE – R. LUTTMANN

Everything I need to talk about is on the agenda.

There was an article in the Press Democrat last Sunday about Green Music Center and there was some information contained in this article, which to my knowledge, has not been distributed to campus. Has not been made to the Senate nor to this body and I am concerned about that. I want to mention that as one point, and I want to suggest on the basis of this article that it is time for the Senate to get another report. I note in particular that the administration has decided to go back to Plan B, which was suppose to build the center in two phases. The last time we discussed this last spring, that possibility had been put on the table, it had been rejected on a number of grounds, one being that it would cost more, another being that there was some sort of infrastructure problem on the second part that was needed to support the first part. There were also concerns about the academic part of the building, where was that, and when would that be built second. So I think that there are a lot of questions. And it is time for another report

N. Byrne: So you are proposing that a report on the current state of the Green Center be presented?

R. Coleman-Senghor: Larry is here. I would like to here from Larry. One of the reasons that Jim Meyer, yourself and others who came to apprise us of the state of affairs with the Green Center. And at the time a general approach to both future funding and construction strategy was laid out. And the economic situation, both in the region and the nation, and also the phasing has changed significantly. And while you may not have much to do with this, I think it is absolutely crucial that the campus, the people who are going to live with this are the ones who receive the first communications about it. Obviously, this report came out and there are those who listened to the report in the Senate and I would like to be able to have a topic scheme that as we go to the Senate we can organize the Senate discussions in such a way that we understand what the present situation of the funding, what are the strategies as you see with the funding, what is this going to mean in terms of future costs which is essentially a delay phasing change. I think I mentioned to you before that I have worked with the Planning Commission and Design Review Commission in Cotati. So, I am very much attuned to how developers come in and deal with these issues, and I do know that there are additional costs that are tied to this. And then the central part of the argument, is that we are not only constructing a building that was going to be a connection to the community, but was going to serve fundamentally an educational goal. If that fundamental goal has changed, the faculty should be the first group to know about it. Could you please give us a description of what has actually occurred so that we can prep the faculty for discussion.

N. Byrne: And, you are requesting that we do this now?

R. Coleman-Senghor: I am requesting that it be offered to us now.

VICE PRESIDENT, ADMIN. AND FINANCE – L. FURUKAWA-SCHLERETH

L. Schlereth: Just every little thing.

R. Coleman-Senghor: No, no Larry. Not every little thing, but \$28 million is not a little thing.

N. Byrne: Larry would you like to discuss now? Or defer until later?

L. Schlereth: No I would be happy to answer the question. If you would remember to back to the presentation that I made about a year ago. You might recall that we discussed a phased approach. Phase I, II and III. That was based on the financial information that I had at the time. And I said I would update that information quarterly, which is a standard financial procedure. I have done this and it can be found on the WWW. Nothing has changed. Nothing is inconsistent about the phased approach. The numbers have only improved because many pledges have come in and are now shown as cash, which at that time were only pledges and now they have been collected. Interest has also been earned on that monies. I think what I said in the report, is that, if we did Phase I and II together, the overall cost of the project would be less, based upon what I was presented to you, expect updated figures based on our financial statements.

It is my sentiment, that this is a better question for Stewart Jones, rather than me. I believe that the fund raising that includes Stewart, President, symphony people and a number of other persons who are active in the project have begun to focus on what they think is the most appropriate strategy to raise money in this down economy. This is now going on beyond my expertise. But the sense is once you get a project going then this has a tendency to stimulate giving. For example, the Mondavi Center in Davis broke ground before they even had the money because that activity was begun to stimulate giving. Again this is a fundraising strategy, so my expertise is more limited. And it would be more appropriate for Stewart to respond.

S. McKillop: Well since I have you on this topic of the Mondavi Center, I wondered if one of the differences is that Mondavi is not giving a dollar until he and his wife are dead. The Regents said that this wonderful and would back this and they put the money in now for when the Mondavi money comes in. My feeling is that, there is a difference between the way the Regents handled and our Trustees. Or maybe Ruben didn't asked the Trustees. I have no idea. But had the trustees said thank you to this \$10 million and take it and we will get it when we get, but we will guarantee this money now for when it comes in. That is what the Regents who have deep enough pockets can do because the money is not there yet. They also sold 10,600 series tickets already this year.

L. Schlereth: If we had the good fortune of being the University of California, we would not be having this conversation. We have about \$18 million in what is called a charitable remainder trust. And they will turn to cash when the people pass. The Regents are so overfunded in their retirement system that they have the ability to take those resources and invest them in the Mondavi Center and they will be repaid when Mr. and Mrs. Mondavi pass away.

B. Byrne: I need to interrupt. We do have one of the members of the budget committee with us for a brief time and we are beyond the time certain. So let us turn to the report of the Senate Budget Committees.

REPORT OF THE SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

N. Byrne: Bill Crowley is here with us. Some of us have seen this. Will not go into details. Should have been presented to the Executive Committee first. As you can see it concerns the uses of the monies from salary savings from the retired faculty, resigned and FERP faculty. The concern of the Budget Committee is the use of these monies for non-instructional purposes. As you can see by the four items, or rather three have to do with those monies concerning the Stevenson remodel, the development office, and the educational mentoring teams and the other item is about lottery funds being used to subsidize Extended Education and Engineering Science. The Senate Budget Committee has taken the position that the instruction monies should be used only for instruction. Also, that the use of the lottery funds to compensate for the reduced return on the endowment is contrary to the information that was given to the faculty at the time the problem was initiated. So the Senate Budget Committee proposes that this be put on the agenda as in information item at the next meeting of the Academic Senate.

R. Coleman-Senghor: I am still concerned again, I spoke about this business of the Education Mentoring Program, being described as non-instructional. It serves us not to not have accurate descriptions, we can still make our case about how the way monies are distributed or signed. I think our strength lies on accurate descriptions. So I am teaching in the EMT and I assume that I am teaching academic content, because this body and other bodies have said it is academic content that I am teaching. That I assume that it is also instructional. So let us get that straight.

B. Goldstein: That is correct, the EMT, the \$100,000 goes to the salaries of the people teaching the freshman seminar. Salary savings are used for sabbatical, promotions. They are built into our base budget using salary savings. Instructional equipment, travel for the faculty - so this money is used for some other things that you would not think as direct instructional. With respect to the \$25,000 lottery funds. This is wrong. We are not paying for a graduate program in Engineering Science, we are paying for laboratory equipment and so forth that is in those laboratories that are in Salazar.

R. Coleman Senghor: Why is the engineering program at all in this language?

B. Goldstein: This might have been my mistake. This ended up in the budget that we gave to the VP Budget Advisory Committee.

R. Coleman-Senghor: \$25,000 in lottery funds is being given to School of Science and Technology with the purpose that it be dedicated to undergraduate education in those laboratories that were build in Salazar. So basically it is OE?

E. Stanny: How much money has the _____ raised for instruction?

B. Goldstein: I don't have those figures so I don't know for sure. But in terms of the Development Office, \$114,000. Designed to make the connection between Academic Affairs and the Development Office. We requested that all School Deans give us priority lists of needs for Academic Affairs. We will consolidate that list and work with the University Development to make sure that these kind of things are generated in terms of development. We felt that we needed that liaison. And this money is designed for that.

R. Luttmann: I just wanted to point out that from the last few comments, that the EMT allocation of \$100,000 has fallen under the heading of Salary Items not previously supported by Academic Affairs.

B. Goldstein: As you remember the history of it. \$200,000 was used to derive from housing. And that we can no longer do. So last year, we put \$100,000 from Academic Affairs from our permanent funding and then temporary funding from \$100,000 to pay for the \$200,000. This year this \$100,000 closes the books on that. From now on Academic Affairs will pay for EMT. That was last years agreement with the VP Budget Advisory Committee.

B. Crowley: I may be wrong, but at the last VPBAC I thought that this \$25,000 lottery money, if I recall the explanation is that it is needed because there was a shortfall in the endowment that the Extended Education Graduate Program and Engineering Science had with the money with that program that that money had been endowed with and so therefore they were not going to be able to fully equipment their labs because their endowment returns did not meet expectations. So this money was meant to make that up. So as explained to the VPBAC is support for this graduate program and extended education

B. Goldstein: That was my mistake. I spoke with Said.

B. Crowley: Said was there too and did not counter that explanation

B. Goldstein: This money cannot go to the graduate program because (conversation interrupted.)

B. Crowley: I understand, but that was how it was explained to VPBAC. And I still have questions regarding this.

A. Warmoth: Can you not speak with Said directly?

B. Crowley: It seems that this is another \$25,000 overexpense by the Salazar remodel, since that is what it is. One way or another it should have been money that had come from another source that is now being taken from lottery funds. On the EMT, I think, Larry you can correct me. Wasn't there \$600,000 that was coming out of the housing funds to support EMT.

L. Schlereth: Only \$200,000 is allowed.

C. Crowley: What about the rest of the \$400,000.

L. Schlereth: Katie could help us on this one. The best of my recollection is that there are three components, a faculty component, which is \$200,000, then there is the SSP which is always eaten by ESAC people. Then there are the students. So when you add them all up, this has always been the faculty component.

B. Crowley: In any case, this represents over the last two years \$200,000 taken out of what was formerly available for other programs that is now going to a program that was sortof planted on the faculty rather than one that was developed by the faculty and I think that is why there is a certain hostilities, too strong a word, for that money coming out of Academic Affairs because it was never done that way until the last two years and now it will always be done that way.

L. Schlereth: It is fair to say that if the EMT would disappear, the \$200,000 would still be needed to put into faculty salary to teach the enrollment that otherwise would have been taught by _____.

B Crowley: Some of us at least would rather see that money used _____.
(Crowley and Schlereth both speaking at the same time.)

L. Schlereth: On the other issue of the Salazar remodel. It could not have been in the Salazar Renovation Budget any money for the equipment of the _____ because that is _____.

B. Crowley: If it is not for the Extended Education Graduate Program in Engineering Science, and it is not for that, if it is for undergraduates, then as I understand, the whole building is equipped, as part of the plan.

L. Schlereth: My understanding after talking with Said is that it is for basic instructional equipment within the School of Science and Technology. But it could be used for instructional equipment in the School of Science and Technology in general. Microscopes and biology for example.

B. Crowley: But wasn't Salazar equipped?

L. Schlereth: There is a group 2 equipment allocation which generally provides the basic furniture - but scientific equipment never came into the budget. I believe computers were given by corporations.

B. Crowley: So graduate programs will never be using this equipment?

L. Schlereth: It is a thin line. But to be fair to the people of California, the primary use, the most dominate should be the undergraduate program.

A. Warmoth: I want to address the issue of EMT. Correct the historical record and make clear that everybody understands that EPC recommended and the Senate approved that the EMT should become a permanent part of _____. In the context of that I think Bob Coleman's correction and the language that it implies that has been diverted to instructions but is not accurate. But there is also, and at this point I need to give part of the EPC Chair's report since it is directly related to this item. What I was going to report is that in view of EPC there are still interesting issues about how resources are being allocated and realized in the EMT program, but in our judgement this needs to be addressed in the context of the structure and resource allocation for the entire freshman year experience. And so what is currently happening is that EPC is establishing task forces to look specifically at the freshman year experience and also at the rest of GE in scheduling for a joint meeting of the EPC and GE subcommittee will be 12 to 1pm on the 31st. And any faculty members who are interested in participating in that meeting are cordially invited. We are looking also to get the Student Affairs component into the agenda. In that context we need to look at the GE Mission of the University that there is a particular focus on the part of both EPC and GE subcommittee to look at freshman year experience and the rest of the GE curriculum. And so I think in that context various issues about resource allocation through the EMT program and the freshman year in

general will be reviewed and actually in my opinion there may be some legitimate grounds for raising the question as to whether some co-curricular extra-curricular aspects of the liberal arts curriculum for residential students could in fact be charged to the Residential Life budget. But at this point would be a moot question, we would need to go back and revisit the history of this particular shift from campus housing to academic affairs in relation to the faculty staff and the freshman seminar. So I wanted to put this on the table that this is a major set of issues that EPC has every intention of working closely with the GE subcommittee and the Student Affairs committee to really look at the issues.

R. McNamara: Is this ready to go to the Senate?

C. Goldstein: This is not ready to go to the Senate, not in the sense of the accusations that it makes. It is not correct. A \$100,000 in Educational Mentoring which has just been omitted to is paid salary for the faculty for teaching the freshman seminar.

N. Byrne: We have this report for the next Senate meeting, but prior to that the Senate Budget Committee should meet with Bernie so that the committee can make informed decisions regarding whether or not the report should be modified.

B. Goldstein: We already have the VP Budget Advisory Committee. That is the committee that should make recommendations. I am happy to meet with that committee.

B. Crowley: Bernie, I take exception. At the VPBAC meeting, all the faculty there protested every one of these very forcefully, but we were greatly outnumbered by administrators.

B. Goldstein: Ok, I would be happy to meet with you.

B. Crowley: I would like to see this go to the Senate Floor in whatever form as an informational item to be open for discussion.

M. Byrne: That is my proposal that this be on the Agenda once the Senate Budget Committee modifies the report.

B. Goldstein: I would like to have a chance to work with this document.

R. Coleman-Senghor: I think that the points of difference should be marked out for the members of the Senate. Two descriptions are available to the members of the Senate so they can hear what the VP and hear what the Budget Committee have to say.

B. Goldstein: There is no reason for me to be put up there to have someone take pot shots at. This is a budget. I brought it to the committee. The committee made suggestions and recommendations. I am not going to sit in the middle of the table and get pot shots taken at me. This is an honest attempt to do what faculty would like me to do.

R. Coleman-Senghor: This is in terms of procedural. I do not think it is for us to take pot shots at anybody. What we don't want to have happen in the Senate is for members of the Senate and Faculty to be informed about the differences in the points of view. That is what we want to be able to offer. I have made it clear that I do not think that this report is accurate. I think we need to get at least the differences between the descriptions. The descriptions have to do with positions. There is nothing wrong with positions being layed out in respect to important matters of this kind.

A. Warmoth: I would like to move that we send this back to the budget committee, Bernie has indicated that he is willing to meet with them to sort out the facts and if there are differences of opinions about priorities in the context of some agreement about what the facts are, then the differences in opinion can go forward to the Senate.

R. Coleman-Senghor: Seconded.

N. Byrne: One of the fundamental issues is whether the Senate Budget Committee has the right and authority to make a report. The other issue is regarding differences of views and convictions of the contents of the reports. It seems to me that it is appropriate to put the Senate Budget Report on the agenda, and at the same time, we could if we pass this motion then arrange that there be a meeting with the SBC before the next meeting of the Academic Senate. And that would enter into the nature of the report that was actually made. But the Budget Committee has a right to make a report. I believe that changes will be made if there is an actual corrections.

R. Coleman-Senghor: I would like to call for the question.

N. Byrne: The question has been called.

R. Coleman-Senghor: It is on Art's motion.

N. Byrne: Motion has been approved.

N. Byrne: Katherine Crabbe is here to discuss an important matter.

K. Crabbe: I am here to tell you of my adventures in common management system. I will not tell you all of them. There is one particular thing on my mind. One of the things that we have to do in this system is to set up a whole bunch of rules that will allow the computer to do work for us that we have done by hand. One of the things we have been trying to set up and write the rules for is what happens when a student repeats a course to try to raise a grade. And in the course of setting those rules up, we discovered that our campus practice is not in compliance with Title Five. But somehow, I know not how over the course of time we have gotten away from what Title Five authorizes us to do in ways of letting students repeat courses to change a grade. Title Five says that the campus may give a student permission to repeat a course to attempt to raise a grade. And when a student does that then the second grade replaces the first. That is what Title Five says.

Somehow on our campus, we have gotten into the practice of saying the student may repeat a course to try to improve the grade and if the student actually gets a worse grade the second time than the first time, he gets to get the first grade. So our campus practice has been to say, you get the better grade which ever one it is. But Title Five is quite specific in saying that the student has to take the second grade. So, I do not know how we got to where we are. But here is where we are. I need to get back into compliance with Title Five. So, I came to you because what I think is the appropriate thing to do is to explain to the campus what I have just explained to you. In the process of doing this project I have discovered our current practice is not the way it is suppose to be.

N. Byrne: Would you like this on the Senate Agenda?

K. Crabbe: Not necessarily. The campus needs to move forward and everyone needs to know that as we move forward we will be in compliance with Title Five. It is more of an issue about communication. What I am asking for is your help in communicating this situation.

R. Luttmann: I was under the impression that a student taking a course a second time was not automatically retaking it with the intention of the subsequent grade. But that it had to be requested afterwards. My presumption has always been that if a student did get a worse grade the second time, that the student would simply not so request. In which case, say if it was a three unit course, then it would still be counted but that both grades would be figured into the GPA. I will acknowledge that know one ever told me this. But the more important point here is where it is true to not that the student has to petition to have the new grade replace the old one. Or what is the mechanism by which it happens. I guess I am also curious in this regard as to how this misunderstanding has happened. Isn't this Admissions and Records that handles this?

K. Crabbe: This predates me. As far as everyone that I know in Admissions and Records assures me that we having been doing it this way as long as the human mind can remember. But it is not right.

S. Wilson: Could you provide us with documentation? This would help us out.

K. Crabbe: Yes.

R. Coleman-Senghor: This should be referred to Student Affairs. Because it deals with a Deans Students Affairs issue and it should be brought forth as an information item to the Senate to inform the Senate of a glitch in our past practices. By the way I understood it had to do with the GPA and Progress Report. Which is very crucial in looking at the students. We have a contract with the students, so this needs also to go to Advising. This matter should be referred to Student Affairs for a recommendation and then to the Senate.

K. Crabbe: I will get this ready to go to Student Affairs.

BUSINESS

PROPOSED RESOLUTION REGARDING URTP BE COMPRISED OF MEMBERS REPRESENTING EACH SCHOOL IN THE UNIVERSITY.

P. Marker: There is a practical problem you need to look at. Different schools and the size of the schools in the terms of the URTP process – the structure of the RTP process says that you if you go beyond two levels of review that you reduce the number of faculty who can participate – especially at this time – there are fewer full time tenure track faculty and in some instances not enough to go around. So when we look at those departments we find that we do not have enough tenure track professors to serve.

We are not talking about representation from different Departments, but from Schools.

If you talk about representation from Schools then, one of the largest Schools does not have sufficient number of full time faculty to conduct the business of the year, let us use the English Department for an example. The English Department has at this time 3 fulltime tenured – faculty who can review anyone for the full promotion for professor. Actually you have eight to ten individuals in the department who need to be reviewed. When you are looking at that kind of situation and you are looking at the committees that have to be formed, you have exhausted that. Then you have the school level and you have the university level. So basically what you are going to need are five professors from all departments. And then when you look around at the Schools you will find out from the School is that a number of faculty members are borrowing from other faculty departments in order to form an RTP committee. So there is a practical problem here as you are looking for the ideal solution you need to look at the faculty problem to. And we might have to think about the transitional state institutionally to be able to affect the idea with which I agree with. So I would suggest that it be referred back to FSAC or SAC to look at exactly these kinds of problems

N. Byrne: All those in favor of the Motion to refer this to FSAC, please say aye.

Motion Approved.

N. Byrne thanked P. Marker for presenting and welcomed him to stay for the rest of the meeting. P. Marker thanked him but declined.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE BY-LAWS

Karen Thompson handed out a four page document. The first page outlined the suggested changes to be made to the Academic Senate By-Laws, Article V, Section 3.3.

Change No. 1: Grammatical error. Not controversial.

Change No. 2: Name change. The President's Athletic Board is now called The Athletic Council. Requesting name change to be more accurate. Page No. 4 of her handout proved proof that the name has been changed.

Change No. 3: The Educational Equity Advisory Council name is now defunct. And essentially The Campus Client Committee is now the current name.

Change No. 4. This is the most complicated one. Under the sentence about liaisons, we are thinking about taking out The Alumni Association Board liaison and putting in a more flexible type of position to enable the committee have a liaison that had direct interest and current concern in student affairs, so we would actually say instead of specific committees we would say “a body addressing issues of current concern to the Student Affairs Committee (e.g., Sonoma State University Alumni Association Board, Alcohol and Drug Advisory Council.etc.)

This would have the committee more flexibility with issues that would come up. It is also, to give you a little background on this. We found that the Alumni Board didn’t care to have us there. There is not a big interest on why we should be involved in the past, we are not excluding that as an option, for the liaison position. But some other positions like being on the Drug Advisory Council could be an option.

Warmoth: Suggested “one or more bodies”.....

K. Thompson: Ok

R. Coleman-Senghor: Suggested that this first go to the Student Affairs Committee for a presentation.

Should go to the Structures and Functions Committee first.

R. Luttmann: The first three changes are minor and/or obvious that I don’t think that Structures and Functions would have a problem with it. But No. 4 as you say is more complicated and maybe that should go to Structures and Functions.

N. Byrne: So it is your belief that it should still to go Structures and Functions?

R. Luttmann: Is you wish, we can sent forward the first three now and then the fourth to Structures and Functions.

K. Thompson: Not a big rush.

R. McNamara: Has the Campus Climate Committee chairman welcomes this?

K. Thompson: Has already been discussed.

N. Byrne: Motion made but not seconded.

R. Coleman-Senghor: The fact that Karen is not in a great rush, this should be referred to Structures and Functions for their review and then forwarded directly to the Senate.

R. Luttmann: I think that is proper procedure anyway. (Also asked Karen to send him an ecopy of her document.)

N. Byrne: No motion needed. Karen can go from the table to Structures and Functions directly.

Warmoth announced that he had another meeting to attend and wanted to leave several items from the Senate Agenda. One item is the GE Substitution Resolution would be GE Substitution Policy. And the other is that I am adding to the Resolution on Academic Planning a copy of the Mission Statement of the University, since that Resolution refers to that and the version that I am distributing I am highlighting those sections that specifically refer to our liberal arts and sciences mission. Carol has the copies and I would like to have those redistributed in the Senate package. Thanks. See you later.

N. Byrne: Thanks.

**STRUCTURES AND FUNCTIONS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
REGARDING AUTHORITY OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO ACT FOR THE
ACADEMIC SENATE.**

N. Byrne: Rick, would you like to discuss this?

R. Luttmann: Ya, I guess we were all at the Senate Meeting last week but there seems to be some variation in our collected recollections of what happened. I think it is clear that the proposal from the S&F was defeated.

R. Coleman-Senghor: Yes

R. Luttmann: My recollection that following that, that Victor Garlin made a motion to refer back to Structure and Functions, specifically to incorporate the notion that ‘insession’ means throughout the entire term. I was under the impression that it had passed. Noel says he does not recollect any such decision and Steve says that he recollects that the motion was passed but it did not say that is was perspective – if it was the latter, than I do not know what Structures and Functions is going to do. Because we have already expressed our opinion. Um, and the Senate did not like it. I do not think we can leave this. The question still remains that the current language says something about insession and it is not clear despite what Jackie Boman may think, what insession means. We have looked at Roberts Rules of Order a long time ago and we read what she read to us and I still think that is ambiguous and we have to make our own determination if we are going to stick with this language of insession then we have to say whether insession is this day or that day and or we may just decide to finesse the matter and change the language that currently says. I feel that I need some guidance from this body on which way to go from here, because I do not know the Structures and Functions will do.

R. Coleman-Senghor: So, you are going to fight this. What I have heard, make the recommendation is that the term “insession” would mean that period of time on the

academic calendar from the onset of instruction to its conclusion and that basically what he was saying was that he referred it back with the idea in the language and that the body of proof was that while other elements in this document has to be considered by S&F leaving it open to a lot of stuff that is there, it would have to at least provide a definition of what insession meant. And I would refer you all to good old Merriam, that is Webster. If you look in the dictionary, you will find that insession – session spells it out in terms of a period. Then insession means a symbol, predicated – a gathering – both of them means a process of group continuation and one concluded in terms of the gathering insession. So what we are looking at is not simply the terms but the application of the terms to specific places. One is the pace of the period of time which extends beyond and an assembly or gathering. A particular body gathering at a particular moment. What we need in our language is both the language of session in terms of the period of time which means the beginning of the term and end of the term and insession to mean that we are gathered as we are here – for this hour for this particular duration. Those are two meanings. And I think you see basically, the proposal was referring you to look at that possibility and to bring forth the basically a document which will reflect the definitional question that you raised initially, not necessary settling on the question that you raised about either authority or about the other question of the way in which the Executive Committee can work or act in the absence of the Senate. I do not think that was excluded – the question of the Senate Executive Committee acting in the absence of the Senate. Even while it is insession (first the beginning of the term to the end of term) or while it is out of session. Which is in the summer or what we intersession. I think what the problem is that we have got to get the meanings tied to the particular cases and to address this question of flexibility and expediency that is also in the _____ concern but is not the question of authority. We have to trust the Executive Committee to act in a responsible way – and we need to trust that they will report back to the Senate on their action.

That is my take on it.

R. McNamara: You pretty much said what I think. I really think that this issue has gotten turned around much more than what it needs to. And the two separate issues of insession you have just defined it and I could not have said it any better. I think there was also clarification. I do believe that your interpretation was correct that there are two different view of what insession meant. Mr. Garlin had one from beginning to end of session and Mr. McGough also said that when we are done, we are done. We are out of session. So that is what I saw as the charge. And good luck with it. In terms of authority and all, I don't think that was really the issue that was being addressed. What they felt was that the resolution came forward the way it was presented, I do believe some were interpreting that as asking for more authority. I will just think of one...I mean there were several - Wanda, felt it was a slippery slope. I trust you but don't know what this means down the line. Certainly, it may not have been the intention of the resolution, from S&F but it was interpreted that way. And I think it would be clearer if that was simplified – it does not need to be a big issue.

N. Byrne: Very close to 5pm.

S. McKillop: I was on the list. Why don't we go around to other CSU Senate offices throughout the State and ask how they define on your campus what "in session" is?

N. Byrne: Very good suggestion.

S. Wilson: My recollection is that we do need to come up with a definition of in session, but we can do this by a definition in the by-laws. Of course we will need to come up with a decision of what it means. I think that there is quite a bit of disagreement. This will have to come from the Senate. We will need to come up with a proposed by-law change to present to the Senate – perhaps alternate scenarios. The by-laws could also specific guidelines for the Executive Committee and some checks and balances might end up satisfying some people's concerns.

N. Byrne: These are good suggestions, but we are out of time. This will be continued on the next Agenda.

R. Coleman-Senghor: We should not spend anymore time in the Senate on this issue. We need to thrash out a language – it should be done by the S&F and then brought back to the Executive Committee to be approved to the Senate.

K. Thompson: Seconded (heartily)

R. Luttmann: I am now even more confused.

APPROVAL OF THE SENATE AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 31, 2002

R. Luttmann: Should the Senate get an update on the Green Music Center?

L. Schelereth: I could include this with my Report at the Senate meeting.

B. Goldstein: Stewart and Kashak are working on a complete document updating the campus on the Green Music Center and when this is ready Bernie will have them make a presentation to the Senate.